

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

The applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, the allowance of claims 1-6. These claims have been preserved to preserve their allowable condition.

Also, it should be noted that new claims 15-20 have been added. These claims are very similar to allowable claims 1-6. One key difference is that the anchor body has not been utilized within claims 15-20. Instead a surface means, extending along an axis and having an arcuate interior cross-sectional area, for receiving an axially-elongate tubular post having an arcuate exterior profile has been provided within these claims. As such, these claims are not limited to mere use of a hollow tube anchor body, but focuses more on the broader concept of providing the surface that has the stated structure. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15-20 are similarly allowable.

Turning to the rejection of claims in view of the patent to Oliver, it should be noted that claim 7 now recites that the conical portion is rigid and non-deflecting. It is easily understood from the Oliver patent that the portions 14 and 16 deflect inwardly and are not rigid. As such, claim 17 and the claims dependent therefrom are allowable. Also, it should be noted new claims 13 and 14 provide additional points of distinction over the Oliver patent.

Appl. No. 10/626,913
Amdt. dated January 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 21, 2004

In view of the forgoing it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is condition for allowance and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35451.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

January 21, 2005